



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/615,381	07/09/2003	Takeshi Nishiuchi	000593B	1378

23850 7590 10/31/2006

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP
1725 K STREET, NW
SUITE 1000
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

BUEKER, RICHARD R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1763

DATE MAILED: 10/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/615,381	NISHIUCHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Richard Bueker	1763	

All Participants:

(1) Richard Bueker.

(2) Mr. Kratz.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 1 October 2306

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

the rejections stated in the office action dated 6/15/06

Claims discussed:

21

Prior art documents discussed:

EP 992,605 and US 6,280,792

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Richard Bueker
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner indicated that the amendment to claim 21 in the response filed 10/11/06 overcomes the prior art rejections made in the office action dated 6/15/06. the examiner also noted that claims 14, 15 and 21 were still unpatentable over EP 992,605 and US 6,280,792, which appear to be commonly owned with the present application. EP 992,605 was published prior to the effective US filing date of the present application, and US 6,280,792 has a US filing date prior to the effective filing date of the present application. The examiner noted that it appeared that a rejection over these references could be overcome if applicants were able to perfect their claim for foreign priority by submitting certified translations of their two earliest foreign priority documents. Mr. Kratz indicated that he would check the possibility of perfecting the claim for foreign priority.